UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/638,405	08/12/2003	Avi Penner	361727	5158	
42074 FAEGRE & BI	7590 02/13/200 ENSON, LLP	9	EXAMINER		
ATTN: PATENT DOCKETING (32469)			CAMPBELL, VICTORIA P		
2200 WELLS FARGO CENTER 90 SOUTH SEVENTH STREET		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
MINNEAPOLI	S, MN 55402-3901		3763		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			02/13/2009	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

e-OfficeActionBSC@faegre.com

Examiner VICTORIA P. CAMPBELL 3763 All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel): (1) \(\frac{VICTORIA P. CAMPBELL}{2} \) (3) \(\frac{James Rodgers.}{2} \) (2) \(\text{Catherine Spolar.} \) Date of Interview: \(\frac{03 February 2009.}{2} \) Type: \(\alpha \) Type: \(lutanian Company	10/638,405 PENNER ET AL.		
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel): (1) \(\frac{VICTORIA P. CAMPBELL}. (3) \) \(\frac{James Rodgers}. (4) \) \(\frac{Nick Lucchesi}. \) Date of Interview: \(03 \) \(\frac{February 2009}. \) Type: \(a) \) \(\triangle \) \(Telephonic \) \(b) \) \(\frac{Ideo Conference color Personal [copy given to: 1) \) \(applicant \) \(2) \) \(applicant's representative \) Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: \(d) \) \(\frac{Ideo Conference color Personal [copy given to: 1) \) \(applicant \) \(2) \) \(applicant's representative \) Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: \(d) \) \(\frac{Ideo Conference color Personal [copy given to: 1) \) \(applicant \) \(2) \) \(applicant's representative \) Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: \(d) \) \(\frac{Ideo Conference color Personal [copy given to: 1) \) \(applicant \) \(2) \) \(applicant's representative \) Claim(s) discussed: \(\frac{1.29}{2.9} \) and \(\frac{38}{2.0} \). Claim(s) discussed: \(\frac{1.29}{2.9} \) and \(\frac{38}{2.0} \). Agreement with respect to the claims \(f) \) \(\precedit \) was reached. \(g) \) \(\precedit \) was not reached. \(h) \) \(\precedit \) \(N/A \). Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: \(Examiner thanks Ms. Soolar and Mr. Rodgers for submitting a preliminary copy of possible amendments to the claims, specification, and drawings. \(Regarding the drawing amendment. \) the examiner noted that the amendments to the specification and drawings. \(Regarding the fewing amendment. \) the examiner noted that the amendments to the specification falled to overcome the previous objection based on the use of trademarks and the applicant sepece to further amend the specification. \(Regarding the specification. \) the examiner noted that the amendments to the specification falled to overcome the previous objection based on the use of trademarks and	Interview Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
(1) VICTORIA P. CAMPBELL. (3) James Rodgers. (4) Nick Lucchesi. Date of Interview: 03 February 2009. Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative] Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No. If Yes, brief description: ☐ . Claim(s) discussed: 1, 29, and 38. Identification of prior art discussed: Santini, Jr et al (5,797,898), Sleva (5,488,954), and Pfeiffer (3,536,836). Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Examiner thanks Ms. Spolar and Mr. Rodgers for submitting a prelimirary copy of possible amendments to the claims, specification, and drawings. Regarding the drawing amendment, the examiner noted that the amendments to the specification failed to vercome the previous objection based on the use of trademarks and the applicant agreed to further amend the specification. Regarding independent claims 1, 29, and 38, the examiner and applicant's representatives discussed the prior art currently of record and how it related to the accurate solved with the serious discussion that structure provided by the repriminary amendment. The additional structure provided by the related to the accurate solved was noted by the examiner to require additional search, since no prior limiting structure was provided, applicant agreed and noted that they believe the amendment overcomes the Prefifer reference because its switch appears to be in the "on" position continually, whereas the switch in the instant application has an "active" mode and a "passive" mode to conserve battery life. The examiner will take this into consideration upon submission of a formal response. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE		VICTORIA P. CAMPBELL	3763	
Date of Interview: 03 February 2009. Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative] Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No. If Yes, brief description: ☐	All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO	personnel):		
Date of Interview: 03 February 2009. Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference o Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative] Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If Yes, brief description:	(1) <u>VICTORIA P. CAMPBELL</u> .	(3) <u>James Rodgers</u> .		
Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative] Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If Yes, brief description: Claim(s) discussed: 1, 29, and 38. Identification of prior art discussed: Santini, Jr et al (5,797,898), Sleva (5,488,954), and Pfeiffer (3,536,836). Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) NA. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Examiner thanks Ms. Spolar and Mr. Rodgers for submitting a prelimiary copy of possible amendments to the claims, specification, and drawings. Regarding the drawing amendment, the examiner noted that the amended drawings appear to overcome the current objections. Regarding the specification, the examiner noted that the amendments to the specification failed to overcome the previous objection based on the use of trademarks and the applicant agreed to further amend the specification. Regarding independent claims 1, 29, and 38, the examiner and applicant's representatives discussed the prior art currently of record and how it related to the claims as provided in the preliminary amendment. The additional search, since no prior limiting structure was provided. Applicant agreed and noted that they believe the amendment overcomes the Pfeiffer reference because its switch appears to be in the "on" position continually, whereas the switch in the instant application has an "active" mode and a "passive" mode to conserve battery life. The examiner will take this into consideration upon submission of a formal response. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUS	(2) <u>Catherine Spolar</u> .	(4) <u>Nick Lucchesi</u> .		
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If Yes, brief description: Claim(s) discussed: 1, 29, and 38. Identification of prior art discussed: Santini, Jr et al (5,797,898), Sleva (5,488,954), and Pfeiffer (3,536,836). Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Examiner thanks Ms. Spolar and Mr. Rodgers for submitting a prelimiary copy of possible amendments to the claims, specification, and drawings. Regarding the drawing amendment, the examiner noted that the amended drawings appear to overcome the current objections. Regarding the specification, the examiner noted that the amendments to the specification alied to overcome the previous objection based on the use of trademarks and the applicant agreed to further amend the specification. Regarding independent claims 1, 29, and 38, the examiner and applicant's representatives discussed the prior art currently of record and how it related to the claims as provided in the preliminary amendment. The additional structure provided by the claims with regard to the acoustic switch was noted by the examiner to require additional search, since no prior limiting structure was provided. Applicant agreed and noted that they believe the amendment overcomes the Pfeiffer reference because its switch appears to be in the "on" position continually, whereas the switch in the instant applican has an "active" mode and a "passive" mode to conserve battery life. The examiner will take this into consideration upon submission of a formal response. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, as unmary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE	Date of Interview: 03 February 2009.			
If Yes, brief description: Claim(s) discussed: 1, 29, and 38. Identification of prior art discussed: Santini, Jr et al (5,797,898), Sleva (5,488,954), and Pfeiffer (3,536,836). Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Examiner thanks Ms. Spolar and Mr. Rodgers for submitting a prelimiary copy of possible amendments to the claims, specification, and drawings. Regarding the drawing amendment, the examiner noted that the amended drawings appear to overcome the current objections. Regarding the specification, the examiner noted that the amendments to the specification failed to overcome the previous objection based on the use of trademarks and the applicant agreed to further amend the specification. Regarding independent claims 1, 29, and 38, the examiner and applicant's representatives discussed the prior art currently of record and how it related to the claims as provided in the preliminary amendment. The additional structure provided by the claims with regard to the acoustic switch was noted by the examiner to require additional search, since no prior limiting structure was provided. Applicant agreed and noted that they believe the amendment overcomes the Pfeiffer reference because its switch appears to be in the "on" position continually, whereas the switch in the instant application has an "active" mode and a "passive" mode to conserve battery life. The examiner will take this into consideration upon submission of a formal response. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable, if available, a summary thereof must be attached		²)∏ applicant's representative	e]	
Identification of prior art discussed: Santini, Jr et al (5,797,898), Sleva (5,488,954), and Pfeiffer (3,536,836). Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) NA. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Examiner thanks Ms. Spolar and Mr. Rodgers for submitting a prelimiary copy of possible amendments to the claims, specification, and drawings. Regarding the drawing amendment, the examiner noted that the amended drawings appear to overcome the current objections. Regarding the specification, the examiner noted that the amendments to the specification failed to overcome the previous objection based on the use of trademarks and the applicant agreed to further amend the specification. Regarding independent claims 1, 29, and 38, the examiner and applicant's representatives discussed the prior art currently of record and how it related to the claims as provided in the preliminary amendment. The additional structure provided by the claims with regard to the acoustic switch was noted by the examiner to require additional structure provided by the claims with regard to the appears to be in the "on" position continually, whereas the switch in the instant application has an "active" mode and a "passive" mode to conserve battery life. The examiner will take this into consideration upon submission of a formal response. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable, if available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW OATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUBMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW See Summary of Record of Interview	· 	e)⊠ No.		
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Examiner thanks Ms. Spolar and Mr. Rodgers for submitting a prelimiary copy of possible amendments to the claims, specification, and drawings. Regarding the drawing amendment, the examiner noted that the amended drawings appear to overcome the current objections. Regarding the specification, the examiner noted that the amendments to the specification failed to overcome the previous objection based on the use of trademarks and the applicant agreed to further amend the specification. Regarding independent claims 1, 29, and 38, the examiner and applicant's representatives discussed the prior art currently of record and how it related to the claims as provided in the preliminary amendment. The additional structure provided by the claims with regard to the acoustic switch was noted by the examiner to require additional search, since no prior limiting structure was provided. Applicant agreed and noted that they believe the amendment overcomes the Pfeiffer reference because its switch appears to be in the "on" position continually, whereas the switch in the instant application has an "active" mode and a "passive" mode to conserve battery life. The examiner will take this into consideration upon submission of a formal response. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A S	Claim(s) discussed: <u>1, 29, and 38</u> .			
Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Examiner thanks Ms. Spolar and Mr. Rodgers for submitting a prelimiary copy of possible amendments to the claims, specification, and drawings. Regarding the drawing amendment, the examiner noted that the amended drawings appear to overcome the current objections. Regarding the specification, the examiner noted that the amendments to the specification failed to overcome the previous objection based on the use of trademarks and the applicant agreed to further amend the specification. Regarding independent claims 1, 29, and 38, the examiner and applicant's representatives discussed the prior art currently of record and how it related to the claims as provided in the preliminary amendment. The additional structure provided by the claims with regard to the acoustic switch was noted by the examiner to require additional search, since no prior limiting structure was provided. Applicant agreed and noted that they believe the amendment overcomes the Pfeiffer reference because its switch appears to be in the "on" position continually, whereas the switch in the instant application has an "active" mode and a "passive" mode to conserve battery life. The examiner will take this into consideration upon submission of a formal response. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments be attached been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE NTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE O	Identification of prior art discussed: Santini, Jr et al (5,797,8	398), Sleva (5,488,954), and F	<u> Pfeiffer (3,536,83</u>	<u>6)</u> .
reached, or any other comments: Examiner thanks Ms. Spolar and Mr. Rodgers for submitting a prelimiary copy of possible amendments to the claims, specification, and drawings. Regarding the drawing amendment, the examiner noted that the amended drawings appear to overcome the current objections. Regarding the specification, the examiner noted that the amendments to the specification failed to overcome the previous objection based on the use of trademarks and the applicant agreed to further amend the specification. Regarding independent claims 1, 29, and 38, the examiner and applicant's representatives discussed the prior art currently of record and how it related to the claims as provided in the preliminary amendment. The additional structure provided by the claims with regard to the acoustic switch was noted by the examiner to require additional search, since no prior limiting structure was provided. Applicant agreed and noted that they believe the amendment overcomes the Pfeiffer reference because its switch appears to be in the "on" position continually, whereas the switch in the instant application has an "active" mode and a "passive" mode to conserve battery life. The examiner will take this into consideration upon submission of a formal response. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview	Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g)⊠ was not reached. h)□ N	I/A.	
equirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.	reached, or any other comments: Examiner thanks Ms. Spopossible amendments to the claims, specification, and drawnoted that the amended drawings appear to overcome the examiner noted that the amendments to the specification for of trademarks and the applicant agreed to further amend the 38, the examiner and applicant's representatives discussed claims as provided in the preliminary amendment. The add acoustic switch was noted by the examiner to require addit. Applicant agreed and noted that they believe the amendment appears to be in the "on" position continually, whereas the a "passive" mode to conserve battery life. The examiner we response. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amend allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no callowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached. THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE A INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.	plar and Mr. Rodgers for subrings. Regarding the drawing current objections. Regarding filled to overcome the previous is specification. Regarding into the prior art currently of reconstitutional structure provided by the prior art currently of reconstitutional search, since no prior limited overcomes the Pfeiffer refersivited in the instant application in the instant application in the amendments that when the search in the examiner against the prior of the amendments that when the consideration in the instant application in th	mitting a prelimia amendment, the amendment, the amendment, the amendment cation is objection based dependent claims and how it related to the claims with remaining structure we be a mitting structure with has an "active upon submission are ded would render the substantial could render the substantial cations." SUBSTANCE Could been filed, APP of DAYS FROM TOM TOM TOM TOM TOM TOM TOM TOM TOM T	ry copy of e examiner n, the d on the use s 1, 29, and eted to the gard to the as provided. ts switch " mode and of a formal er the claims claims OF THE LICANT IS
		/Nicholas D.Lucchesi/		

Application No.

Applicant(s)

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3763

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner.
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,
 - (The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

.